

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12 and 31-46 are withdrawn as drawn to non-elected inventions. Claims 13-30 stand rejected. Applicants have amended claims 21 and 30. Upon entry of the Amendments, claims 1-46 remain pending.

Claims 21 and 30 are amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Support for the Amendments is found in the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully request entry of the Amendments.

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants confirm that they elect Group II, claims 13-30 with traverse. MPEP § 803 states that if the search and examination of all claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine on the merits even though they include claims to independent or distinct inventions. Applicants respectfully submit that examination of Group I, II, and III together would not be a serious burden. Accordingly, Applicants request the Restriction Requirement be withdrawn and claims 1-46 examined together.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 21 and 30 are rejected as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 21 and 30 to provide proper antecedent basis for the limitations of the claims. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 13, 14, 16-18, 20, 22, 23, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Katsuki reference (U.S. Pat. No. 4,427,743). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

The Katsuki reference does not disclose or suggest a co-extruded A-B composite sheet (as in claim 13) or a co-extruded A-B-A composite sheet (as in claim 22). Rather, Figure 2 of the reference discloses a laminated panel made of a plastic sheet and glass sheets. Figure 2 further shows a cushioning layer 4 sandwiched between the two plastic sheets 3A' and 3B'. Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of the Katsuki reference is not of co-extruded composite sheets as recited in claims 13 and 22.

The co-extruded A-B composite sheet of claim 13 is illustrated, for example, in Figure 1. Similarly, the co-extruded A-B-A composite of claim 22 is illustrated in Figure 2. Comparison of Figure 1 and Figure 2 of the current application with Figure 2 of the Katsuki reference clearly shows the difference between the disclosures. While the current claims recite co-extruded 2-layer and 3-layer composite structures, the Katsuki reference discloses only a laminated panel containing plastic sheets, glass sheets, adhesive layers, and optional cushioning layers. Further, the reference does not suggest the manufacture or use of co-extruded composite sheets as illustrated in Figures 1 and Figure 2 and as described for example in paragraphs 27-37 of the specification. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under § 102 be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15, 19, 24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Katsuki reference (U.S. Pat. No. 4,427,743) in view of the Friedman reference (U.S. Pat. No. 6,159,608). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

The deficiencies of the Katsuki reference are described above and incorporated herein. Applicants respectfully submit that the Friedman reference does not overcome the deficiencies of the Katsuki reference. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under § 103 be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102/103

Claims 21 and 30 are rejected as anticipated by or in the alternative as obvious over the Katsuki reference. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the amended claims and request reconsideration.

As discussed above, the Katsuki reference does not disclose an A-B composite sheet and/or A-B-A composite sheet as recited in claims 13 and 22, from which the rejected claims depend. Furthermore, there is no motivation to modify the reference's teachings to arrive at the subject matter of claims 21 and 30. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants believe that claims 1-46 as amended are allowable and request an early notice of allowance. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if that would be helpful to resolving any issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Jan 12, 2006

By: Mark A Frentrup

Anna M. Budde
Reg. No. 35,085
Mark A. Frentrup
Reg. No. 41,026
Attorneys for Applicant

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

AMB/MAF/cg